Evaluation Criteria

1. Consistent with CALFED - Is it consistent with CALFED's long-term goals? Would it be retained (+) or abandoned (-) later. Is it in harmony (+) or does it conflict (-) with CALFED's long-term goals.

   + *very consistent, compatible with programs, or part of a long-term project*
   o neutral, neither strongly consistent nor inconsistent, or partly consistent, partly inconsistent (needs explanation - such as consistent, but would be superseded).
   - inconsistent, conflicts with CALFED, or would be abandoned.

2. Assurances potential - Does implementation allow for uncertainty in use (-)? Does it require assurances to guarantee extensive mitigation or other projects to offset impacts (-)? Is it self-limiting (+)? (i.e. Is it for a limited and defined amount that cannot be circumvented?)

   + self-limiting, few assurances needed
   o some assurances needed (explain)
   - extensive or difficult assurances needed

3. Availability of funding.

   + Funding is identified and available immediately.
   o Funding sources are likely, but not assured or are conditioned.
   ? Funding not known.
   - Funding not available, likely to be difficult or a problem.

4. Cost - Total capital and O&M costs, costs per acre-foot (quantitative).

5. Implementability - Does it require extensive review and permitting by multiple agencies, and/or purchase of extensive rights-of-way from numerous entities (-)? Are there significant problems or obstacles to implementation (-)?

   + Few permits, or permits already obtained, few or no obstacles.
   o Some permits, obstacles, but likely to move forward on schedule (explain).
   - Many obstacles, permits, probably difficult implementation.

6. Mitigation Potential - How much mitigation is needed? Does it require projects that offset impacts (-)? Are there likely to be secondary impacts that could stop the project because mitigation is difficult or impossible (-)? Does it provide mitigation for other actions (e.g., as a secondary purpose)?

   + Self-mitigating, none need or easily done; provides secondary mitigation (explain).
   o Needs mitigation or projects, but they are feasible and likely to be carried out (explain).
   - Extensive mitigation, problematic in one or more areas.

7. Environmental benefits other than water supply. Does it provide environmental benefits other than water supply (+)? Examples: timing of diversions, fish or wildlife benefits (direct or indirect), flexibility.

   + Definite benefits.
   o Possible benefits or neutral.
   - No benefits likely, requires mitigation.

8. Water supply benefits - quantify (volume per year, rate of diversion, yield or maximum volume).

9. Water quality benefits - Does it provide water quality benefits to beneficial uses?

   + Provides definite benefits to some or many uses.
   o May provide benefits, depends on how it is operated (explain).
   - No benefits, likely to hinder water quality improvements, needs mitigation.

10. Environmental impacts - Does it avoid impacts (+) or produce significant impacts (-)? Does it require significant mitigation (-)?

    + Impacts avoided or are minimal.
    o Requires mitigation, but mitigation is likely or depends on how the project is operated (explain).
    - Mitigation is required and problematic.

11. Water supply impacts - Does it have impacts on some users (-)? Does it require mitigation (-)?

    + No impacts or minimal impacts.
    o Some impacts, but they can be mitigated or they depend on how the project is operated (explain).
    - *Extensive impacts or impacts that are difficult to mitigate.*

12. Water quality impacts - Does it have impacts on some beneficial users (-)? Are mitigation measures or offsetting projects required (-)?

    + No impacts or minimal impacts.
    o Some impacts, but they can be mitigated (explain).
    - Extensive impacts or impacts that are difficult to mitigate.

13. Unresolved issues (list).

D-060794